

Appendix J

November 8, 2005, Henderson, Nevada Public Meeting Documents

J.1 Sign-In Sheet (1)

Bureau of Reclamation
Development of Colorado River Management Strategies Under Low Reservoir Conditions Scoping Meeting
Sign-In Sheet

November 8, 2005

[illegible]

Appendix J

November 8, 2005, Henderson, Nevada Public Meeting Documents

J.2 Sign-In Sheet (2)

Development of Colorado River Management Strategies Under Low Reservoir Conditions Scoping Meeting Sign-In Sheet

November 8, 2005

[illegible]

Appendix J

November 8, 2005, Henderson, Nevada Public Meeting Documents

J.3 Sign-In Sheet (3)

Development of Colorado River Management Strategies Under Low Reservoir Conditions Scoping Meeting Sign-In Sheet

November 8, 2005

[illegible]

Appendix J

November 8, 2005, Henderson, Nevada Public Meeting Documents

J.4 Transcript

1

2

3

4

5

PUBLIC MEETING

6

US DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

7

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

8

9

10

11

12

Held at the Henderson Convention Center

13

200 Water Street

14

Grand Ballroom C

15

Henderson, Nevada

16

17

18

19

On Tuesday, November 8, 2005

20

From 6:00 to 8:00 p.m.

21

22

23

24

25

Reported by: Lori M. Judd, CCR #233, RMR

1 HENDERSON, NEVADA, TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 2005, 6:00 PM

2 * * * * *

3 MR. FULP: Welcome to this public meeting
4 concerning the development of lower basin shortage
5 guidelines and coordinated management strategies for
6 Lake Powell and Lake Mead under low reservoir
7 conditions.

8 I'm Terry Fulp with the Bureau of
9 Reclamation in Boulder City and the Lower Colorado
10 Region, and because we have not a large audience, I'm
11 going to go ahead and ask that we just go around and
12 introduce ourselves, please.

13 (Introduction of audience members.)

14 MR. FULP: Thank you.

15 If you do choose to make a comment,
16 please make sure -- we'll hand you a microphone and
17 state your full name and spell it so we get it
18 recorded properly.

19 I think that's about it for the
20 housekeeping. Let's just get started.

21 (Slide presentation by Mr. Fulp.)

22 MR. FULP: Questions? Are there any questions
23 about that information? Okay, good. Then let me
24 walk into the comment period.

25 Again, there are several ways you can

1 submit your comments. And again, we're looking for
2 comments that would help us with this formulation of
3 these alternatives we are going to actually study in
4 the environment impact statement, as well as other
5 factors that you think need to be considered in the
6 study.

7 Here's how you can submit them,
8 certainly tonight by public comment, we give you that
9 opportunity; you can send them to us by U.S. mail; by
10 fax; or by e-mail, and there is a handout with these
11 addresses in the back. Please feel free to take them
12 and we remind you that the comment, this comment
13 period ends at close of business Wednesday, November
14 30. Okay, with that, I'll open it up to, if anyone
15 would like to give us a comment this evening.

16 MR. CAAN: I've got a comment, if I may, and I
17 think everyone will hear me without the microphone.

18 My name is George Caan. I'm the
19 Executive Director of the Colorado River Commission.
20 I'll give you a card.

21 First, I want to thank the Bureau of
22 Reclamation for having put on these meetings and
23 getting the public's input into this plan. Today I'm
24 speaking not as the director of the Colorado River
25 Commission, but instead as a board member of the

1 Colorado River Energy Distributors Association, known
2 as CREDA. CREDA is a nonprofit organization composed
3 of power customers who take power from the upper
4 basin projects, known as the CRSP.

5 My purpose today is to offer to the
6 bureau a suggestion to insure that the bureau work
7 closely with western to analyze impact to the basin
8 fund for whatever shortage criteria that comes out,
9 and let me be specific. The revenues from the Upper
10 Colorado River projects paid by power customers go
11 into a basin fund and then those revenues and funds
12 are used to pay for the operation, maintenance,
13 repair and upkeep of those projects. In addition to
14 that, over \$20 million is used from that fund to pay
15 for environmental programs that are not power
16 related, directly power related.

17 The shortage criteria and the drought
18 could or will have an impact on the power production
19 of those facilities. Therefore, the revenues
20 produced by those facilities will be reduced. We
21 aren't suggesting what to do with respect to that
22 reduction, all we're saying is that we would like the
23 bureau to work very closely with western to assess
24 the impact on that fund from the shortage criteria,
25 and then to look at strategies that might be put in

1 place in appropriations or others to pay for some of
2 the non-power related costs and help support the
3 funding of the operation and the maintenance of those
4 facilities. Thank you.

5 MR. FULP: Thank you. Other comments?

6 It's okay, take your time.

7 Going one last time, anyone else?

8 Okay, then we thank you for coming.

9 This concludes this public meeting,
10 although we will stay here until 8:00 p.m. as we've
11 published. So if you think of something else you
12 wanted to tell us, please come back and our recorder
13 will record you on that.

14 Thanks a lot.

15 (Break in proceedings.)

16 (Continued public statement.)

17 MR. HIATT: I'm John Hiatt, H-I-A-T-T, and this
18 opportunity to address shortage criteria is an
19 historic opportunity to maybe relook at some of the
20 things that have been done on the Colorado River
21 system, starting in the 1920s.

22 The bureau's own projections suggest
23 that shortage will be the norm in the future on the
24 Colorado River, so therefore, what we are doing here
25 with addressing shortage criteria is really looking

1 at the future rules as to how we will divvy up the
2 Colorado River.

3 It's very important that we not repeat
4 the mistakes that were made in the 1920s, when it was
5 done originally, so this is really the opportunity to
6 do that.

7 One of the things that should happen
8 here is that the range of interests at the table
9 during these discussions should be expanded. In the
10 1920s it was only the states at the table. At this
11 point in time environmental interests need to be
12 included as well and there can certainly be
13 responsible environmentalists who can and would
14 participate in terms of the procedures and in terms
15 of deciding how the river should be divvied up. One
16 needs to look at the impacts on users, and that
17 includes wildlife, that includes every possible user
18 of water and decisions made that will have the least
19 permanent or long-term impact. That would mean in
20 terms of farmers, people growing wheat would be
21 shorted before people growing oranges or dates or
22 something that requires a long lead time to produce a
23 crop.

24 We also need to look at the impacts of
25 the shortage criteria on off-river resources because

1 one of the things that will happen is when water from
2 the river is not available, people will use ground
3 water and that ground water in some cases will come
4 from sources which drain directly into the river. In
5 other cases it will come from places which drain into
6 other basins, but we need to look at what will happen
7 when people go to alternative sources, and those
8 impacts may take place as much as, or more than 100
9 miles away from the river itself, but they are going
10 to be significant.

11 We need to look at the impact on some
12 of the minor drainages in the lower basin as a result
13 of what happens here in terms of shortage criteria.
14 That would be things like the Virgin River, the Muddy
15 River, and even as far away as the Amargosa River,
16 which doesn't connect in any way to the Colorado, but
17 ground water pumping to make up shortage on the
18 Colorado River system could dramatically impact that
19 very minor drainage, but one that is vital in its
20 land area.

21 In terms of management of the lake,
22 Lake Powell and Lake Mead, that's in some ways
23 relatively simple because it's really two big
24 interests there. There's recreation, power
25 generation. Wildlife interests are significant, but

1 not nearly as great. And there are certainly
2 mathematic formulas to figure out the most efficient
3 way to generate power between the two reservoirs to
4 maximize the amount of power generated.

5 Las Vegas is in a unique position in
6 this scheme of things because it's the only large
7 city on the river and it both takes water out of the
8 river and it puts effluent back into the river. So
9 therefore not only does it affect the river
10 volumetrically, but it affects it water quality-wise,
11 and that's very important.

12 So as we deal with shortage criteria
13 and less water in the river, water quality becomes of
14 greater and greater importance. Salinity, which has
15 been on the back-burner for the last two decades,
16 needs to come forward as a major. The more saline
17 the water, the more water is required for irrigation.
18 So it means that water used downstream will be less
19 efficiently used. So all of the upstream people who
20 put water into the river and all of the upstream
21 sources of saline water need to be examined so that
22 salinity and water quality are addressed as key
23 components in terms of river management. This was
24 started many years ago and essentially fell by the
25 wayside.

1 The other thing that needs to be looked
2 at is how states can trade water with one another.
3 This has been something which basically hasn't
4 happened until recently. There's still a number of
5 obstacles to the free trade of water between the
6 states, but in the final analysis as we are
7 addressing an over-committed river, we will have to
8 address how water can be traded between those who
9 need it, who need it most, and those who maybe can
10 find either other alternatives or can find that other
11 economic activities and other economic benefits, for
12 instance money, can be traded for water.

13 That's all.

14 MR. FULP: Thank you.

15 (Meeting concluded at 8:00 p.m.)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

2

3 STATE OF NEVADA)
4) ss.
COUNTY OF CLARK)

5

6 I, Lori M. Judd, a duly commissioned Notary
Public, Clark County, State of Nevada, do hereby
7 certify:

8

That I reported the foregoing
proceedings on Tuesday, November 8, 2005, commencing
at the hour of 6:00 p.m.

9

10 That I thereafter transcribed my said
shorthand notes into typewriting and that the
typewritten transcript of said proceedings are a
11 complete, true and accurate transcription of my said
shorthand notes taken down at said time.

12

I further certify that I am not a
13 relative or employee of an attorney or counsel
involved in said action, nor a person financially
14 interested in said action.

15

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set
my hand and affixed my official seal in my office in
16 the County of Clark, State of Nevada, this _____
day of _____, 2005.

17

18

19

20

21

LORI M. JUDD
CCR #233, RMR

22

23

24

25